CHAPTER  7

CONCLUSIONS & SUGGESTIONS

7.1  INTRODUCTION
Present study “E-Information Literacy: A Case Study” was concerned with
the science faculty and its 312 responded students of BAMU. Information was
collected from the students, in the form of using structured questionnaire
separately designed for the students. The data collected from the respondents
through the questionnaire was tabulated and analyzed. Statistical techniques like
correlation, chi-square, TI, Ti-Sqaure & WAM were used in the analysis. The
findings in relation to the objectives (1.3) have been discussed. The objective of
this chapter is to conclude the results & findings of present study.

7.2  CONCLUSIONS
The conclusions / findings have been presented under the following
headings.

7.2.1  Current Developments in Information Literacy

7.2.2  Information Literacy in BAMU

7.2.3  E-Information Literacy in BAMU

7.2.4  E-Information Literacy & It’s Feedback

7.2.1  Current Developments in Information Literacy
Information literacy is the critical issue for the 21st century of keen
importance to all educational stakeholders, including administrators, faculty,
librarians etc. The information explosion of the late 20th century subsequently
gave birth to the concept of information literacy (ACRL, 2002). Therefore it is
necessity of 21st century to include information literacy in education.

The development of information literacy is central to the academic
success. Information literacy makes the students beyond the role of passive
listener and note taker and allows them to take some direction and initiative
during class. The main purpose of including this in education system is to direct
the students that will allow them to discover the material they work with fellow students to understand the curriculum (Faust, 2001).

7.2.1.1 Scope of Information Literacy

Scope of information literacy is broadly presented in a number of ways, formats is as follows.

- **By Media**
  - Visual Literacy
  - Media Literacy
  - ICT Literacy
    - Computer Literacy
    - Digital Literacy
    - Network Literacy
  - Library Literacy

- **By Contents (Aspects)**
  - Tool Literacy
  - Resource Literacy
  - Socio-Structural Literacy
  - Research Literacy
  - Publishing Literacy
  - Emerging Technology Literacy
  - Critical Literacy

- **By Methods**
  - Lessons
  - Instructions
  - Stand Alone Courses / Classes
  - Online Tutorials
  - Workbooks
  - Course Related Instructions
  - Course Integrated Instructions
  - Training
Students Training
  Staff Training

By Models
  - Kuhlthaus Model
  - Ellis Model
  - SCONUL Model
  - Mckinsey Model
  - Empowering 8 Models
  - Seven faces of information literacy

Apart from these models various models have been put forth by different authors namely, Web based tutorials for information literacy by Sundin (2008); Li, Leung and Tam (2007); Dalgleish and Hall (2000); Drew, Abbott and Orr (2003); Community information literacy model by Seneviratne (2004); E-learning tutorial for vocational e-literacy by Elliott and Hunn (2005); Vickery’s model of information transfer (Harris, 2006); intensive information literacy model by Hearn (2005); Teaching information literacy skills by Oladokun (2006); the use of electronic information services and information literacy by Crawford (2006); convergent model for information literacy by Mackey and Ho (2005); IT orientation course for librarians model by Madhusudhan (2005); information literacy and competency development program by Majumdar and Rajesh Singh (2008); teaching information literacy a questionnaire by Kennedy (2005); Digital information fluency model by IMSA (2008); information literacy model for academic libraries by Deshpande and Shelar (2005); Sieberhagen (2005); Instruction and funding models by Whitehead and Quinlan (2008); model for information literacy course development by Loo and Chung (2006); Sharkey (2006); Reflective Online searching skills (ROSS) model by Bruce, Edwards and Lupton (2006); Partridge (2008); information literacy model for role of librarians by Baradol and Gopalkumar (2005); RAC model, Research Cycle, Follett’s Information skills model by Chandran (2005); LOUISIANA information literacy model for lifelong learning by University of Louisiana (2004); models of information literacy training in the undergraduate curriculum by King (2007);
Information literacy tutorial by SJSU University (2004); Hunn and Rossiter (2006); University of Massachusetts (2001); Queensland University of Technology (2000).

➢ **By Standards**

- Information Literacy
- Independent Learning
- Social Responsibility
- ACRL standards for Information Literacy
- National Subject matter Association Curriculum Standard
- Mathematics Standards
- Social Studies Standards
- Science Standards
- Foreign Language Learning Standards
- National Geography Standards
- English Language Arts Standards
- National History Standards
- Economics Standards
- Physical Education Standards

7.2.1.2 **Approaches**

- The big six problem-solving approach
- Current Approaches
  - Online Information Literacy
  - The Information Literacy Course
  - Information Literacy across the Curriculum

7.2.1.3 **Evaluation Indicators**

- Portfolio Assessment
- Learning and Research Logs
- Rubrics for the Assessment of information Literacy
7.2.2 Information Literacy in BAMU

Purpose of Information Requirement

➢ Of the total 312 respondents 78 (25.00%) were accessing information for Assignment purpose, 94 (30.12%) were accessing information for Seminar purpose, 126 (40.38%) were accessing information for Examination purpose, 245 (78.53%) were accessing information for Subject Knowledge purpose & 104 (33.33%) were accessing information for Review of Literature purpose.

➢ There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Purpose of Information Requirement (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). All M.Sc students reported higher Assignment Purpose of Information Requirement (n=78). M.Sc students reported higher Seminar Purpose of Information Requirement (n=71) as compared to Ph.D (n=23). All M.Sc students reported higher Examination Purpose of Information Requirement (n=126). M.Sc students reported higher Subject Knowledge Purpose of Information Requirement (n=139) as compared to Ph.D (n=106). Ph.D students reported higher Review of Literature Purpose of Information Requirement (n=97) as compared to M.Sc (n=7).

Locating Information for Study / Research

➢ Of the total 312 respondents 259 (83.01%) were locating information in Library for study / research, 19 (6.08%) were asking for information on ILL, & 308 (98.72%) were locating information on Internet. This indicates that the hypothesis, “Awareness of Internet use is prominent” (Hypothesis No.2) is valid.

➢ There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Locating information for Study / Research (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Locating information in Library for Study / Research (n=173) as compared to Ph.D (n=86). M.Sc students reported higher Locating information on Internet for Study / Research (n=177) as compared to Ph.D (n=131). Ph.D students reported higher Locating information on ILL for Study / Research (n=12) as compared to M.Sc (n=7).
Use of Computer

- Of the total 312 respondents majority 268 (85.90%) respondents were fluent in use of computer.
- Of the total 191 Male respondents 174 (91.10%) were using computer, while out of the total 121 Female respondents 113 (93.38%) were using computer fluently.
- Of the total 312 respondents 73.72% respondents from 22 – 33 age group were fluently using computer, while respondents using computer fluently from age group of 34 – 45 were ranging from 83.00% - 100.00%, which makes it clear that age does not affect fluent use of computer.
- There was a significant difference among subject groups regarding the use of Computer (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). Biological Sciences reported higher use of Computer (n=98) followed by Pure Sciences (n=86) & Mathematical & Computer Sciences (n=84).

Frequency of Using Computer

- Of the total 312 respondents 195 (62.50%) respondents were using computer daily, 68 (21.80%) respondents were using computer once in a week, 41 (13.14%) respondents were using computer once in a month & 15 (4.81%) respondents were using computer once in a while.
- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the frequency of using Computer (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher daily use of Computer (n=110) as compared to Ph.D (n=91). M.Sc students reported higher Once in a week use of Computer (n=38) as compared to Ph.D (n=30). M.Sc students reported higher Once in a month use of Computer (n=31) as compared to Ph.D (n=10). M.Sc students reported higher Once in a while use of Computer (n=14) as compared to Ph.D (n=1).

Frequency of Using Internet

- Of the total 312 respondents 189 (60.58%) respondents were using Internet daily, 61 (19.56%) respondents were using Internet once in a week, 54 (17.30%) respondents were using Internet once in a month & 8 (2.56%)
respondents were using Internet once in a while. This indicates that the hypothesis, “Awareness of Internet use is prominent” (Hypothesis No.2) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the frequency of using Internet (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Daily use of Internet (n=98) as compared to Ph.D (n=91). M.Sc students reported higher Once in a week use of Internet (n=31) as compared to Ph.D (n=30). M.Sc students reported higher Once in a month use of Internet (n=36) as compared to Ph.D (n=18). All M.Sc students reported higher Once in a while use of Internet (n=8).

**Time Spent on Internet**

- Of the total 312 respondents 12 (3.84%) spent less than 1 hour a week on Internet, 28 (8.98%) spent 1 – 4 hours a week on Internet, 76 (24.35%) spent 5 – 6 hours a week on Internet, 157 (50.32%) spent 7 – 9 hours a week on Internet & 39 (12.50%) spent more than 10 hours a week. This indicates that the hypothesis, “Awareness of Internet use is prominent” (Hypothesis No.2) is valid.

- Of the total 39 respondents 36 (92.30%) were from the age group of 30 – 45, while only 3 (7.70%) were in the age group of 26 - 29. It is surprising to note that no one from age group 22 – 25 was using Internet for more than 10 hours a week.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Time Spent on Internet (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Time Spent Less than 1 hour a Week (n=9) as compared to Ph.D (n=3), M.Sc students reported higher Time Spent Less than 1 – 4 hours a Week (n=18) as compared to Ph.D (n=10), M.Sc students reported higher Time Spent Less than 5 – 6 hours a Week (n=50) as compared to Ph.D (n=26), M.Sc students reported higher Time Spent Less than 7 – 9 hours a Week (n=92) as compared to Ph.D (n=65) & Ph.D students reported higher Time Spent More than 10 hours a Week (n=29) as compared to M.Sc (n=10).
Place of Accessing Internet

- Of the total 312 respondents 141 (45.19%) were accessing Internet at Netcafe, 106 (33.98%) were accessing Internet at Home, 217 (69.56%) were accessing Internet at UGC INFONET Center, 187 (59.94%) were accessing Internet at their own Department, 92 (29.48%) were accessing Internet at University Library. This indicates that the hypothesis, “Awareness of Internet use is prominent” (Hypothesis No.2) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Place of Accessing Internet (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Netcafe aspect in Place of Accessing Internet (n=80) as compared to Ph.D (n=61), M.Sc students reported higher Home aspect in Place of Accessing Internet (n=54) as compared to Ph.D (n=52), M.Sc students reported higher UGC-INFONET Center aspect in Place of Accessing Internet (n=117) as compared to Ph.D (n=100), Ph.D students reported higher Own Department aspect in Place of Accessing Internet (n=97) as compared to M.Sc (n=90), Ph.D students reported higher University Library aspect in Place of Accessing Internet (n=56) as compared to M.Sc (n=36).

Experience of Using Internet

- Of the total 312 respondents 51 (16.34%) were having experience of using Internet less than 6 months, 147 (16.34%) were having under 1 year experience of using Internet, 80 (25.65%) were having over 1 year experience of using Internet & 34 (10.90%) were having over 5 year experience of using Internet. This indicates that the hypothesis, “Awareness of Internet use is prominent” (Hypothesis No.2) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the experience of using Internet (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher experience of using Internet less than 6 months (n=40) as compared to Ph.D (n=11), M.Sc students reported higher under 1 year experience of using Internet (n=99) as compared to Ph.D (n=48), M.Sc students reported over 1 year experience of using Internet (n=41) as
compared to Ph.D (n=39) & Ph.D students reported over 5 year experience of using Internet (n=25) as compared to M.Sc (n=9).

Satisfaction Level of Using Internet

- Of the total 312 respondents 139 (44.56%) were fully satisfied by using Internet, 88 (28.20%) were partially satisfied by using Internet & 85 (27.24%) were unsatisfied by using Internet.
- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Satisfaction Level of using Internet (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Fully Satisfied by using Internet (n=78) as compared to Ph.D (n=61). M.Sc students reported higher by using Internet (n=52) as compared to Ph.D (n=36). M.Sc students reported higher Unsatisfied by using Internet (n=56) as compared to Ph.D (n=29).

Skills for Using Internet

- Of the total 312 respondents 140 (44.88%) were rate the Skill for using Internet is Excellent, 96 (30.76%) were rate the Skill for using Internet is Very Good, 39 (12.50%) were rate the Skill for using Internet is Good, 28 (8.98%) were rate the Skill for using Internet is Fair & 9 (2.88%) were rate the Skill for using Internet is Poor. This indicates that the hypothesis, “Awareness of Internet use is prominent” (Hypothesis No.2) is valid.
- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Skill for using Internet (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Skill for using Internet is Excellent (n=80) as compared to Ph.D (n=60). M.Sc students reported higher Skill for using Internet is Very Good (n=73) as compared to Ph.D (n=23). M.Sc students reported higher Skill for using Internet is Good (n=22) as compared to Ph.D (n=17). M.Sc students reported higher Skill for using Internet is Fair (n=23) as compared to Ph.D (n=5). All M.Sc students reported higher Skill for using Internet is Poor (n=9).

Purpose of Browsing Internet

- Of the total 312 respondents 294 (94.23%) were using Internet for E-mail purpose, 231 (74.03%) were using Internet for using E-resources & 157 (50.32%) were using Internet for using OPAC. This indicates that the
hypothesis, “Awareness of Internet use is prominent” (Hypothesis No.2) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Purpose of Browsing Internet (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported were higher in Browsing Internet for E-mail (n=164) as compared to Ph.D (n=130). M.Sc students reported were higher for the Browsing Internet (n=125) for use of E-resources as compared to Ph.D (n=106). M.Sc students reported were for Browsing Internet (n=125) for the purpose of using OPAC as compared to Ph.D (n=106).

**Fluency of Using E-mail**

- Of the total 312 respondents majority i.e. 262 (83.98%) respondents were fluent in use of e-mail.
- Of the total 191 Male respondents 154 (80.63%) were using e-mail, while out of the total 121 Female respondents 96 (79.33) were using e-mail fluently.
- Of the total 262 respondents 219 (83.57%) were from the age group of 22 – 33, while 43 (16.43%) were in the age group of 34 – 45 using e-mail fluently. This makes it clear that the age does not affect use of e-mail fluently.
- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Fluency of using E-mail (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Fluency of using E-mail (n=143) as compared to Ph.D (n=119).

**Need Training for Using E-mail Service**

- Of the total 312 respondents 63 (20.19%) respondents required training for using e-mail service.
- Of the total 63 respondents all i.e. 63 (100.00%) were from the age group of 22 – 33, while no one from age group of 34 – 45 required training for using e-mail service.
- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using e-mail service (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using e-mail service (n=42) as compared to Ph.D (n=21).
7.2.3 E-Information Literacy in BAMU

Use of E-journals

- Of the total 312 respondents 287 (91.98%) respondents were using e-journals. This indicates that the, *hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.*

- Of the total 155 respondents all (100.00%) from 26 – 45 age group were using e-journals, while respondents using e-journals in the range of 84.08% to 100.00% were in the age group of 22 – 25 years.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the use of E-journals (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher use of e-journals (n=164) as compared to Ph.D (n=123).

Need Training for Using E-journals

- Of the total 312 respondents 208 (66.66%) users need training for using E-journals. This indicates that the, *hypothesis “Majority of the students’ realize the need of user training” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid* and “E-resources accessibility is poor” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using e-journals (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using e-journals (n=106) as compared to Ph.D (n=102).

Use of E-thesis & dissertation (ETD)

- Of the total 312 respondents 190 (60.90%) of the users are using E-Thesis & Dissertations (ETD). This indicates that the, *hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.*

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the Use of ETD (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). Ph.D students reported higher Use of ETD (n=114) as compared to M.Sc (n=74).

Need Training for Using ETD

- Of the total 312 respondents 251 (80.45%) users need training for using ETD. This indicates that the, hypothesis “*Majority of the students’ realize the
need of user training” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid and “E-resources accessibility is poor” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using ETD (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using ETD (n=136) as compared to Ph.D (n=115).

**Use of E-books**

- Of the total 312 respondents majority 259 (83.01%) of the users are familiar with the E-books. This indicates that the, hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the Use of E-books (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Use of E-books (n=139) as compared to Ph.D (n=120).

**Need Training for Using E-books**

- Of the total 312 respondents 153 (49.04%) users were of the opinion that they need training for using E-books. This indicates that the, hypothesis “Majority of the students’ realize the need of user training” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid and “E-resources accessibility is poor” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using E-books (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using E-books (n=94) as compared to Ph.D (n=59).

**Use of E-archives**

- Of the total 312 respondents 164 (52.56%) users were using E-archives. This indicates that the, hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the use of E-archives (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). Ph.D students reported higher Use of E-archives (n=100) as compared to M.Sc (n=64).
Need Training for Using E-archives

- Of the total 312 respondents 138 (44.23%) of the users need training for using E-archives. This indicates that the hypothesis “**Majority of the students’ realize the need of user training**” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid and “**E-resources accessibility is poor**” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using E-archives (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using E-archives (n=106) as compared to Ph.D (n=32).

Method for Searching E-resources

- Of the total 312 respondents 155 (49.68%) were using trial & error method for searching E-resources, 118 (37.83%) were taking guidance from other research scholar for searching e-resources, 158 (50.65%) were using self thought method for searching e-resources, 184 (58.98%) were asking teachers for searching e-resources & 107 (34.29%) were taking guidance from laboratory staff for searching e-resources. This indicates that the hypothesis, “**Awareness of e-resources is present among students** (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Method for Searching E-resources (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). Ph.D students reported higher Trial & Error aspects in Method for Searching E-resources (n=94) as compared to M.Sc (n=61). M.Sc students reported higher Guidance from other Research Scholar aspects in Method for Searching E-resources (n=98) as compared to M.Sc (n=20). Ph.D students reported higher Self Thought aspects in Method for Searching E-resources (n=98) as compared to M.Sc (n=61). M.Sc students reported higher Guidance from Teachers aspects in Method for Searching E-resources (n=114) as compared to Ph.D (n=70). M.Sc students reported higher Guidance from Laboratory Staff aspects in Method for Searching E-resources (n=82) as compared to Ph.D (n=25).
Purpose of Using E-resources

➤ Of the total 312 respondents 211 (67.63%) were accessing e-resources for updating subject knowledge, 185 (59.29%) were accessing e-resources for review of literature, 88 (28.20%) were accessing e-resources for the preparation of course material, 161 (51.61%) were accessing e-resources for paper publication, 180 (57.70%) were accessing e-resources for workshop / seminar & 118 (37.83%) were accessing e-resources for project work. This indicates that the, hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.

➤ There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Purpose of using E-resources (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). Ph.D students reported higher Update Subject Knowledge aspects in Purpose of using E-resources (n=122) as compared to M.Sc (n=89). Ph.D students reported higher Review of Literature aspects in Purpose of using E-resources (n=113) as compared to M.Sc (n=72). M.Sc students reported higher Course Material aspects in Purpose of using E-resources (n=71) as compared to Ph.D (n=17). Ph.D students reported higher Paper Publication aspects in Purpose of using E-resources (n=86) as compared to M.Sc (n=75). Ph.D students reported higher Workshop / Seminar aspects in Purpose of using E-resources (n=101) as compared to M.Sc (n=79). M.Sc students reported higher Project Work aspects in Purpose of using E-resources (n=81) as compared to Ph.D (n=37).

Use of Search Engine

➤ Of the total 312 respondents majority 310 (99.36%) users were using search engines, except 2 i.e. each 1 user for Bio-chemistry & Chemical Technology were not using search engines.

➤ Of the total 312 respondents 100.00% Male & 98.35% Female respondents using search engines.

➤ Of the total 312 respondents using search engines were from age group of 22 – 25 were ranging from 98.23% to 100.00%. Which makes it clear that age does not affect use of search engine.
➢ There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the use of Search Engine (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher use of Search Engine (n=178) as compared to Ph.D (n=132).

**Need Training for Using Search Engine**

➢ Of the total 312 respondents 28 (8.97%) respondents need training for use of search engines.

➢ There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using Search Engine (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using Search Engine (n=28).

**Use of Subject Gateways**

➢ Of the total 312 respondents 193 (61.86%) users were using the subject gateways in their respective subject. This indicates that the, hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.

➢ There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the use of Subject Gateways (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher use of Subject Gateways (n=103) as compared to Ph.D (n=90).

**Need Training for Using Subject Gateways**

➢ Of the total 312 respondents 215 (68.91%) of the users felt that they need training in using subject gateways. This indicates that the, hypothesis “Majority of the students’ realize the need of user training” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid and “E-resources accessibility is poor” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.

➢ There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using Subject Gateways (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using Subject Gateways (n=139) as compared to Ph.D (n=76).

**Use of OPAC**

➢ Of the total 312 respondents 190 (60.90%) users were using OPAC facility provided by various libraries. This indicates that the, hypothesis,
“Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the use of OPAC (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). Ph.D students reported higher use of OPAC (n=104) as compared to M.Sc (n=86).

Need Training for Using OPAC

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using OPAC (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using OPAC (n=130) as compared to Ph.D (n=86).

Searching Articles

- Of the total 312 respondents 141 (45.19%) were searching articles with the help of subject heading, 138 (44.23%) were searching articles with the help of author, 207 (66.34%) were searching articles with the help of full text, 199 (63.79%) were searching articles with the help of journal title, 222 (71.15%) were searching articles with the help of keyword & 141 (45.19%) were searching articles with the help of abstract.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Searching Articles (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). Ph.D students reported higher Searching Articles by Subject Heading (n=73) as compared to M.Sc (n=68). Ph.D students reported higher Searching Articles by Author (n=87) as compared to M.Sc (n=51). Ph.D students reported higher Searching Articles by Full Text (n=111) as compared to M.Sc (n=96). M.Sc students reported higher Searching Articles by Journal Title (n=112) as compared to Ph.D (n=87). M.Sc students reported higher Searching Articles by Keywords
(n=111) as compared to Ph.D (n=111). Ph.D students reported higher Searching Articles by Abstract (n=79) as compared to M.Sc (n=62).

Preferable Format for Downloading

- Of the total 312 respondents 279 (89.42%) were preferring PDF format for downloading, 191 (61.21%) were preferring HTML format for downloading, 146 (46.80%) were preferring DOC format for downloading & 81 (25.97%) were preferring RTF format for downloading. This indicates that the, **hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.**

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding preferable format for downloading (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher PDF format for downloading (n=161) as compared to Ph.D (n=118). M.Sc students reported higher HTML format for downloading (n=101) as compared to Ph.D (n=90). Ph.D students reported higher DOC format for downloading (n=85) as compared to M.Sc (n=61). Ph.D students reported higher RTF format for downloading (n=54) as compared to M.Sc (n=27).

Availability of E-journals

- Of the total 312 respondents 236 (75.64%) were aware about the availability of the e-journals from UGC-INFONET Consortium, 180 (57.70%) were aware about the availability of the e-journals on CD-ROM & 154 (49.35%) were aware about the availability of the e-journals on DOAJ. This indicates that the, **hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid and “E-resources accessibility is poor” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.**

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Availability of E-journals (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Availability of E-journals through UGC-INFONET Consortium (n=130) as compared to Ph.D (n=106). Ph.D students reported higher Availability of E-journals through CD-ROM (n=102) as compared to M.Sc
Ph.D students reported higher Availability of E-journals through DOAJ (n=97) as compared to M.Sc (n=57).

**Place of Accessing E-resources**
- Of the total 312 respondents 136 (43.59%) were accessing e-resources at Netcafe, 103 (33.01%) were accessing e-resources at Home, 207 (66.34%) were accessing e-resources at UGC INFONET Center, 181 (66.34%) were accessing e-resources at their own Department & 107 (34.29%) were accessing e-resources at University Library. This indicates that the hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.
- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Place of Accessing E-resources (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Netcafe aspect in Place of Accessing E-resources (n=72) as compared to Ph.D (n=64). M.Sc students reported higher Home aspect in Place of Accessing E-resources (n=53) as compared to Ph.D (n=50). Ph.D students reported higher UGC-INFONET Center aspect in Place of Accessing E-resources (n=108) as compared to M.Sc (n=99). Ph.D students reported higher Own Department aspect in Place of Accessing E-resources (n=105) as compared to M.Sc (n=76). Ph.D students reported higher University Library aspect in Place of Accessing E-resources (n=67) as compared to M.Sc (n=40).

**Problems faced while Accessing E-resources**
- Of the total 312 respondents 204 (65.38%) were facing problem about Not Easy to Use, 151 (48.39%) were facing problem about Difficult to Read on Screen, 61 (19.56%) were facing problem about Time Consuming, 285 (91.34%) were facing problem about Lack of Training & 91 (29.16%) were facing problem about Lack of IT Knowledge. This indicates that the hypothesis “Majority of the students’ realize the need of user training” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid and “E-resources accessibility is poor” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.
There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Problem faced while accessing E-resources (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Not Easy to Use Problem faced while accessing E-resources (n=132) as compared to Ph.D (n=72). M.Sc students reported higher Difficult to Read on Screen Problem faced while accessing E-resources (n=93) as compared to Ph.D (n=58). M.Sc students reported higher Time Consuming Problem faced while accessing E-resources (n=42) as compared to Ph.D (n=19). M.Sc students reported higher Lack of Training Problem faced while accessing E-resources (n=178) as compared to Ph.D (n=107). M.Sc students reported higher Lack of IT Knowledge Problem faced while accessing E-resources (n=72) as compared to Ph.D (n=19).

E-journals: Fee or Free
- Of the total 312 respondents 207 (66.35%) of the users feel that e-journals should be available fee based remaining 105 (33.65%) users are felt that e-journals should be open source i.e. free of cost.
- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding E-journals should be available fee based (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher E-journals should be available fee based (n=121) as compared to Ph.D (n=86).

Use of Open Source Journals
- Of the total 312 respondents 157 (50.32%) users were using open source journals. This indicates that the, hypothesis, “Awareness of e-resources is present among students (Hypothesis No. 4) is valid.
- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the use of Open Source Journals (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher use of Open Source Journals (n=81) as compared to Ph.D (n=76).

Need Training for Using Open Source Journals
- Of the total 312 respondents 220 (70.51%) users require training for using of Open Source Journals. This indicates that the, hypothesis “Majority of the
students’ realize the need of user training” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid and “E-resources accessibility is poor” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using Open Source Journals (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using Open Source Journals (n=114) as compared to Ph.D (n=106).

**Retrieval of Information**

- Of the total 312 respondents 232 (74.35%) were using general search for retrieval of information, 163 (52.24%) were using advance search for retrieval of information. This indicates that the, hypothesis “**Majority of the students’ realize the need of user training**” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid and “**E-resources accessibility is poor**” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding for Retrieval of Information (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher General Search for Retrieval of Information (n=117) as compared to Ph.D (n=115). Ph.D students reported higher Advance Search for Retrieval of Information (n=65) as compared to M.Sc (n=98).

**Need Training for Using E-resources**

- Of the total 312 respondents 211 (67.63%) users need training for using e-resources, while 32.37% users do not need training. This indicates that the, hypothesis “**Majority of the students’ realize the need of user training**” (Hypothesis No. 1) is valid and “**E-resources accessibility is poor**” (Hypothesis No. 3) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding the need training for using e-resources (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher need training for using e-resources (n=149) as compared to Ph.D (n=62).

**Satisfaction Level**

- Of the total 312 respondents 139 (44.56%) were fully satisfied about the infrastructure facilities provided by university for accessing e-resources, 85 (27.24%) were partially satisfied about the infrastructure facilities provided by
university for accessing e-resources & 88 (28.20%) were unsatisfied about the infrastructure facilities provided by university for accessing e-resources. This indicates that the hypothesis, “**E-resources accessibility is poor**” (**Hypothesis No. 3**) is valid.

- There was a significant difference among class i.e. M.Sc & Ph.D regarding Satisfaction Level with infrastructure facilities provided by University (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05). M.Sc students reported higher Fully Satisfied with infrastructure facilities provided by university (n=78) as compared to Ph.D (n=61). M.Sc students reported higher Partially Satisfied with infrastructure facilities provided by university (n=56) as compared to Ph.D (n=29). M.Sc students reported higher Unsatisfied with infrastructure facilities provided by university (n=52) as compared to Ph.D (n=36).

**7.2.4 E-Information Literacy & It’s Feedback**

Researcher had analyzed & tabulated the 312 questionnaire filled in by respondents, in that researcher found that respondents were unable to retrieve e-information, accessibility of e-information was poor, therefore they needed training for accessing e-information, using advance search for retrieval of e-information. Hence researcher developed E-Information Literacy demo packages viz.

- Tutorial on E-journals
- Tutorial on E-books
- Tutorial on ETD
- Tutorial on OPAC
- Tutorial on Subject Gateways

Researcher developed tutorial including following search criteria

1. General Search
   a. Journal Homepage
   b. Table of Content
   c. Author Index
   d. Abstract
e. Full Text HTML / PDF

2. Advance Search
   a. Boolean Operators
      i. AND, OR, NOT etc.
   b. Author Search
   c. Keyword Search
   d. Keyword & Subject Area
   e. Keyword, Subject Area & Year

3. Find Title of E-books
   a. Book Details
   b. Full Text HTML / PDF / DOC

4. Search for ETD
   a. Theses Details
   b. Full Text of Theses

5. Library OPAC
   a. Search Title
   b. Author Search
   c. Subject Search
   d. Keyword Search
   e. Class No. Search
   f. Department Search
   g. Location

With these tutorials respondents were given demo along with user manuals.

After that, Researcher designed feedback questionnaire, included questions on the aforesaid regarding i.e. General Search, Advance Search, Find Title of E-books, Book Details, Search for ETD, Full Text of Theses, and Library OPAC etc. With these tutorial training was given & feedback was collected, regarding their satisfaction level. The response received were analyzed & presented in respect of each tutorial.
7.2.4.1 Tutorial on E-journals

- Satisfaction levels regarding various outcomes of tutorial on e-journals were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05) among the respondents. Satisfaction level regarding General Search was highest (402) followed by Publisher / Journal Homepage (396), Back Volumes of Journals (374), satisfaction level regarding Advance Search was lowest (370).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Publisher / Journal Homepage aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding General Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Advance Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Back Volumes of Journals aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- It can be noted from the table 6.4.2.6 that of the 50 respondents 26.93% to 34.61% & 20.84% to 54.16% were either occasionally, frequently or highly satisfied regarding the Publisher / Journal Homepage aspect in tutorial on E-journals were from M.Sc & Ph.D respectively.
No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from M.Sc & Ph.D Students (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from both gender i.e. Males & Females (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Publisher / Journal Homepage aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding General Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Advance Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Back Volumes of Journals aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

### 7.2.4.2 Tutorial on E-books

Satisfaction levels regarding various outcomes of tutorial on e-books were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05) among the respondents. Satisfaction level regarding Find Title of E-books was highest (420) followed
by Book Details (400), satisfaction level regarding Full Text Book was lowest (382).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Find Title of E-books aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Book Details aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from M.Sc & Ph.D Students (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from both gender i.e. Males & Females (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Find Titles aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Book Details aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported
by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Full Text Book aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

7.2.4.3 Tutorial on ETD

- Satisfaction levels regarding various outcomes of tutorial on ETD were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05) among the respondents. Satisfaction level regarding Search for ETD & General Search was highest (312) followed by Theses Details (304), Full Text of Theses (298), satisfaction level regarding Advance Search was lowest (286).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Search for ETD aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding General Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Advance Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Theses Details aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no
significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Full Text of Theses aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from M.Sc & Ph.D Students (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from both gender i.e. Males & Females (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Search for ETD aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding General Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Advance Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Theses Details aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no
significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

➢ The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Full Text of Theses aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

7.2.4.4 Tutorial on OPAC

➢ Satisfaction levels regarding various outcomes of tutorial on OPAC were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05) among the respondents. Satisfaction level regarding General Search was highest (324) followed by Advance Search (310), Location (294), Library OPAC (292), satisfaction level regarding Book Details was lowest (272).

➢ The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Library OPAC aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

➢ The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding General Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

➢ The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Advance Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)
The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Book Details aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Location aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from M.Sc & Ph.D Students (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from both gender i.e. Males & Females (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Library OPAC aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding General Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Advance Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).
The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Book Details aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Location aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

7.2.4.5 Tutorial on Subject Gateways

- Satisfaction levels regarding various outcomes of tutorial on e-journals were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05) among the respondents. Satisfaction level regarding Publisher / Journal Homepage was highest (310) followed by General Search (290), satisfaction level regarding Advance Search was lowest (282).

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Publisher / Journal Homepage aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding General Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05)

- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Advance Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various subject groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported
by respondents from Biological, Mathematical & Computer Science, Pure Science (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

- No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from M.Sc & Ph.D Students (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).
- No significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from both gender i.e. Males & Females (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).
- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Publisher / Journal Homepage aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).
- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding General Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).
- The distribution of satisfaction levels regarding Advance Search aspect of the tutorial was found to be uniform among the various age groups i.e. no significant difference was found in distribution of satisfaction levels reported by respondents from 22 – 25, 26 – 29, 30 – 33, 34 – 37, 38 – 41 & 42 – 45 age groups were significantly different (Chi Square Test, alpha 0.05).

7.3 SUGGESTIONS

7.3.1 For University Authorities
1. The library should start bulletin board services to inform the Ph.D scholars & M.Sc Students about new additions of e-resources & consortium.
2. Introduce proper feedback systems to know about proper use of e-resources facility.
3. Number of journals available through consortia should be increased to access more journals in their respective field.

4. More trained and skilled staff should be appointed, who are trained in the functioning of both software & hardware, which will help the students in areas like accessing, downloading & printing of e-resources.

5. Library collection link should be provide to the detailed bibliographic information about the collection and also online access to some of the e-journals, databases and e-books, etc.

**7.3.2 For Heads of the Department**

1. The faculty should organize regular workshops to enhance usage of e-resources.

2. It should provide printing facility of e-resources free or at a minimum cost.

3. User training should be given for the proper exploitation of e-resources to give justice to UGC-INFONET Programme.

4. Heads of the Department should motivate the students to adopt the skills for accessing E-resources.

**7.3.3 For Teachers**

1. Teachers should be aware about latest trends in his subject field.

2. Teachers should give guidance to students for how to access e-information.

**7.3.4 For Research Scholars**

1. Research students should aware the latest online information in his / her fields in any format i.e. e-journals, e-books, etd, opac etc.

2. Research Scholars should attend the workshops like Information Literacy, Information & Communication Technology [ICT], Online Accessing Information, Use of E-resources.

3. The researcher should write in peer reviewed journal.
7.3.5 For M.Sc Students
1. M.Sc students should be aware of the latest online information in his / her fields in any format i.e. e-journals, e-books, etc, opac etc.
2. They should interact with the Researchers, laboratory staff as well as teachers.

7.4 AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY
Considering results of the present study, further research is need on the following aspects
1. Use of e-resources by other faculty students apart from science faculty.
2. Use of e-resources by teachers in BAMU can be undertaken.
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